DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 850 TM 011 394

AUTHOR Kapel, David E.; And Others
TITLE Psychological and Social/Emotional Fitness for Teacher Education Students: A National Survey of Current Practices.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; Mental Health; *National Surveys; *Preservice Teacher Education; Psychological Characteristics; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS *National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

The national survey focused on whether there is a standard set of practices with regard to establishing the psychological and social/emotional fitness of teacher candidates. Another focus of the study was to assess whether there are differences between National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and non-NCATE approved institutions as related to these issues. A total of 161 institutions responded to the survey (106 NCATE, 55 non-NCATE), representing 58.55% of the institutions that were sent instruments; all but one state was represented in this study. Most of the states do not require evidence of the psychological and social/emotional fitness of future teachers. However, most institutions do consider such fitness; few use formal instruments or procedures in their assessments. "Overall stability" and the "ability to function in the classroom" were most often mentioned by the subjects as important elements of psychological and social/emotional fitness. Although the NCATE and non-NCATE institutions responded similarly to many of the items, differences in several notable areas were attributed to their sizes (large public and small private, respectively). Questions about assessment and assessment procedures used by institutions preparing teachers are discussed. Four tables are appended. (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293850

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL FITNESS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS: A NATIONAL SURVEY OF CURRENT PRACTICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DAVID E. KAPEL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

David E. Kapel
Professor of Education, Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations and Dean

Paul Gerber
Associate Professor of Education, Department of Special Education and Habilitative Services, and Associate Dean

University of New Orleans
College of Education
Lakefront
New Orleans, Louisiana 70148
(504) 286-6719

Henry B. Reiff
Instructor, Special Education
Southeastern Louisiana University
Hammond, Louisiana 70402

Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, April, 1988

TM 011 394

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The national survey focused on whether there is a standard set of practices with regard to establishing the psychological and social/emotional fitness of teacher candidates. Another focus of the study was to assess whether there are differences between NCATE and non-NCATE approved institutions as related to these issues. A total of 161 institutions responded to the survey (106 NCATE, 55 non-NCATE), this represented 58.55% of the institutions sent instruments; all but one state was represented in the study. The majority of states do not require evidence of the psychological and social/emotional fitness of future teachers. Most institutions do, however, consider such fitness; few use formal instruments or procedures in their assessments. Although the NCATE and non-NCATE institutions responded similarly to many of the items, there were differences in several notable areas. The article raises questions about assessment and assessment procedures used by institutions preparing teachers.

INTRODUCTION

Teacher education in the past several years has come under considerable scrutiny from inside the profession (Carnegie Forum on Education and Economic Development, 1986; The Holmes Group, 1986); outside the profession (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), and in the general public. Part of the concerns articulated throughout the country deal with the academic preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers. Most of the focus is on the teacher education units in the universities.

There is another dimension dealing with teacher preparation that has not been the focus of many of the national studies and reports nor part of the national debate - that is the psychological and social/emotional fitness of those who enter the teaching profession. The importance of this issue can not be overlooked or understated. In the NCATE Redesign Standards (1985), it is suggested that psychological tests might be an optional set of criteria for the admission of candidates into teacher education. Historically, teacher educators have had to deal with moral, ethical and legal questions involved in determining psychological and social/emotional fitness. Yet little if any research or writing appears in the literature regarding this issue. For example, Gorth and Chernoff (1986) wrote a text on testing for teacher certification. The text focused primarily on certification testing, i.e. state-wide competency examinations. A good deal of the discussion was spent on reviewing the technical, legal and psychometric issues

surrounding such testing. However, the book did not deal at all with the psychological and social/emotional assessment of teachers within the scope of competency in the classroom.

Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 has a direct bearing on the issue of psychological and social/emotional fitness. Its provisions in spirit and intent require institutions of higher education and employers (among others) not to utilize discriminatory practices of procedures on the basis of handicap alone. As more and more handicapped students attend institutions of higher education, and some in all likelihood enroll in teacher education, institutions of higher education will be faced with issues concerning Section 504 (Marion and Iovacchini, 1983). Most recently United States Supreme Court decisions have allowed institutions to restrict individuals, who have physical disabilities, from enrolling in the helping professions (oftentimes it would appear to be a violation of Section 504). One of the most notable cases involved Francis Davis, a licensed practical nurse, who applied for a nursing program at Southeastern Community College in North Carolina (Flygare, 1979); she was not admitted to the program because of her hearing disability. Her case went to the United States Supreme Court, which held that the college was within its rights to nt admit her to the program. The basic argument was, that a nurse needs hearing in order to function effectively as a nurse, and that her handicap actually prevented her from safely performing in both the nurse training program and in her proposed profession. Teacher education has no less types of restrictions concerning the psychological, social, and emotional well-being of

its teachers. Simply put, it would not be appropriate to admit (or certify) a person into teacher education who has psychological and/or emotional disabilities because this would not allow the individual to perform the various and complex duties of a classroom teacher.

How an institution establishes exclusionary criteria for disabilities is extremely crucial. Criteria for establishing such "handicaps" are not readily available. State legislatures have not taken the initiative to set these standards (nor should they necessarily), and many state departments of education (certification offices) tend to make generalized statements concerning the psychological and social/emotional stability of teacher candidates and/or those applying for certification. When asked to give direction, often it is left up to the institution of higher education. The major question of the study proposed by the authors is to study whether there is a standard set of practices with regard to establishing the psycholocial and social/emotional fitness of a teaching candidate. Another focus of the study is to determine whether there are differences between NCATE and non-NCATE approved institutions with regard to these issues.

METHODOLOGY

Using the 1986-87 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Directory, the investigators for the study, randomly selected National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and non-NCATE accredited institutions for the study, with at least one NCATE and one non-NCATE approved

institution of higher education from each state (exception being Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands and Wyoming that do not have NCATE approved institutions in their state, and North Dakota and Vermont that have all of their institutions of higher education NCATE approved). The total number of institutions surveyed was 275.

The first mailing was sent on September 10, 1986 asking that the instruments be returned no later than October 10, 1986. Allowing for late responses and delays in the postal system, the investigators set a date of November 10 as an end of the first mailing cycle. In the first mailing, 60 NCATE institutions and 31 non-NCATE institutions responded; this amounted to 41.66% of the NCATE institutions in the survey responding and 23.66% non-NCATE institutions responding. Total response (NCATE + Non-NCATE) rate in the first mailing was 33.09% (based on 275).

After November 10 the investigators sent a second mailing to those institutions that did not respond to the first mailing. In the second mailing, 84 instruments were sent to NCATE institutions; the investigators received 46 back or 54.76% One hundred instruments were sent to non-NCATE institutions in the second mailing, and 24 or 24.00% responded.

A total of 161 responses were received from the first and second mailings. At least one institution from forty-nine (49) states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are found in this study. The response rate for NCATE institutions was 73.61% (106 responses) and 41.98% (55 responses) for non-NCATE institutions. The 161 amounted to 58.55% of the 275 institutions involved in the survey. A response rate of at least fifty

percent is adequate for analysis and reporting, while sixty percent rate is considered good in survey research (Babbie, 1973).

Instrumentation

A four page instrument was developed by the investigators. The first section of the instrument elicited demographic information, i.e. name of the institution, type of institution (public, private), title of the teacher education unit, total enrollment of the university and total teacher education enrollment, information on NCATE approval and reviews, etc. The major portion of the instrument, amounting to 18 questions, related to: 1) general criteria used; 2) the practice of determining psychological and social/ emotional fitness of teacher education students; 3) intervention procedures used; and 4) exit and/or re-entry practices.

More specifically, questions focused on practices and procedures used by colleges and departments of education related to admission, retention, and recommendation for certification. Several questions, included in the instrument, focused on factors external to the College of Education - state statutes, communication with state departments and/or certification offices and legal support for procedures used in determining psychological and social emotional fitness. Respondents were asked to provide: priority order to items listed; check-offs; short answers; and open-ended responses. If available, respondents were asked to supply materials of procedures and instruments that they used in assessing the psychological and

social/emotional fitness of students.

For purposes of reporting in this study, the first and second mailings were merged within the NCATE and the non-NCATE institutions. The rationale for merging the two subsets of data was based on the fact that there were clearly no significant or major differences in the responses of the groups to the items on the instrument. Not all 106 of the NCATE institutions responded to every item, therefore, numbers in the results section of this survey will not always equal an N of 106. This is also true for the non-NCATE institutions (N=55) responding to the instrument. The total number reported reflects only those who responded to the individual item on the instrument.

RESULTS

Demographic Data

Typically the NCATE institutions are public (77%) with free standing schools/colleges of education (72%), while the non-NCATE respondents were typically found in private institutions (73%) with only 65% of the respondents located in free standing schools/colleges of education (Refer to Table 1). Only eight (8) of the NCATE institutions respondent group fell within a non-school/college of education unit whereas 19 out of the 54 non-NCATE institutions (that responded to this section) fell within the non-school/college of education unit.

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3 about here

The enrollment characteristics of the two groups were quite different. It appears that the NCATE respondents' institutions, as a group, were much larger than the non-NCATE. Although it

should be noted that the mode enrollment for both group institutions is 1,000 to 4,999. (Refer to Table 2).

The enrollments in teacher education are consistent with the total institutional enrollments, that is, the NCATE respondents had large undergraduate teacher education programs as well as having large graduate teacher education programs, and the non-NCATE respondents tended to have smaller undergraduate teacher education programs.

Specific Responses to the Psychological and Social/Emotional Fitness Items.

The data reported on this sub-section will be presented as an aggregate (NCATE plus non-NCATE) unless there is a major difference between the NCATE and non-NCATE respondents. The investigators will note such differences (refer to Table 4).

Insert Table 4 About Here

Twenty-two percent (22%) of both respondent groups indicated that their state had statutes or laws concerning psychological fitness, while twenty-seven (27%) of both groups responded that their state had statutes or laws related to the social/emotional fitness of teacher education candidates (refer to Item 1, Table 4); these percentages represent a total of 20 states for psychological fitness and 23 states for social/emotional fitness. More NCATE institutions (N=15, 16%) than non-NCATE institutions (N=6, 11%) were required to provide evidence of psychological fitness to their State Department of Education or certification office, this was also true for

social/emotional fitness (N=17, 20%) NCATE and 13% (N=7) Non-NCATE (Item 2).

When asked "Even if no psychological and/or social/emotional requirements were set by the state, did the institution consider such fitness when recommending certification" (item # 3) at either the graduate or undergraduate levels, seventy-three percent (73%) of the responding NCATE institutions indicated that such information was considered when recommending certification. Eighty-six (86%) of the responding non-NCATE institutions indicated that they considered such fitness in the recommendation process. When considering the total number of non-NCATE institutions, the forty-two (42) institutions responding to Item 3 represents 76.4% of the total number of non-NCATE institutions in this study. Although both types of institutions (NCATE/non-NCATE) consider fitness an important issue in certification, it appears that the non-NCATE institutions value this slightly more than do the NCATE institutions. This finding could be a function of several factors. For example, non-NCATE institutions in this study are typically private, smaller institutions with fewer numbers of students in teacher education. They have a more homogeneous student population. Some are church related and therefore are not as restricted by state departments of education as are public institutions in how restrictive they review their teacher education candidates.

Respondents were asked to make comments (if any) to item # 3 of the instrument. The majority of the NCATE institutions did not respond. However, it is interesting to note that six (6) of the institutions indicated that they undertook an informal evaluation

of teacher education students at the undergraduate level, five (5) indicated that advisors make judgment before admission to the program, and four (4) indicated that they only considered this an issue when a problem was evident. The non-NCATE institutions, as a group, also elected not to respond. However, five (5) rresponded that students were referred to couseling if a problem existed, five (5) indicated that there were no official criteria for psychological and/or social/emotional fitness and therefore they do not deal with it, and four (4) pointed out that the teacher education students were evaluated in this area during their student teaching experience.

Respondents were asked to list or describe the general criteria, definition or behavioral characteristics that are used in establishing psychological (Item 4) and/or social/emotional (Item 5) fitness (items 4 and 5 are not listed in Table 4). Fifty-four (54) or 51% of NCATE institutions responded to these items, while thirty-five (35) or 64% of the non-NCATE institutions responded. Both groups indicated that overall stability was one of the general criteria used in establishing fitness. Ability to function interpersonally in the classroom was another criteria used extensively by both groups. Ability to take stress and to take criticism were other elements listed by the groups. Capacity to perceive reality was also mentioned by some respondents. Other respondents used scores of standardized tests, but these were used less than other subjective criteria like field observations, recommendations by faculty, recommendations by cooperating teachers, non-faculty

recommendations, and routine counseling interviews. Such elements as: self-esteem, acceptance, self-control, self-concept, responsibility, attitudes, consistency, and maturity were on the lists of both groups. Although the response rates for the two groups were different, the over-all elements listed by the two groups are similar in content.

When formal tests are used in assessing psychological and/or social/emotional fitness, they are used most often as instruments for admission to teacher education (Item 6). It should be noted that very few institutions responded to this item. However, one hundred three (103) NCATE and forty-eight (48) non-NCATE institutions use non-testing procedures to assess psychological and/or social/emotional fitness: the most used is direct observations, followed by indirect or informal observations (Item 7). Critiques from cooperating teachers during student teaching is another approach used. Both groups were quite similar in their approaches, with the one exception - the interview. Non-NCATE institutions used the interview approach more than NCATE institutions. Both groups tended to use the non-testing procedures for the same purposes (Item 8): "admission to teacher education," "after being admitted to teacher education," and for "admission to student teaching."

Respondents were asked to identify the standardized and non-standardized instruments used to assess psychological (Items 9, 10) and social/emotional (Items 11, 12) fitness. Very few institutions identified the instruments they used. For psychological fitness, only two respondents used the MMPI, while one each used: California Psychological Index, Thematic

Apperception, Self-Report Inventory, Thurston Temperment Scale, and Adjective Self Description. Non-standard approaches used were: recommenddation forms (2), evaluations form (1), observation checklist (1), modified Edwards (1), personality inventory (1), autobiographical information form (1), and one word sentence completion (1). No cut-off scores were supplied by the respondents. Respondents listed even less instruments or approaches to assess social/emotional fitness. No standardized instruments were listed, while only two non-standardized approaches were listed - "observational checklist" and "behavior in/out of class." Deans (or their designee) or a faculty committee use the information culled from the procedures used to assess the psychological and/or social/emotional fitness of the students (refer to Item 13). It is interesting to note that faculty committees in NCATE institutions use such inforamtion more than deans, while the reverse is true for non-NCATE institutions.

One hundred (100) NCATE and fifty (50) non-NCATE respondents indicated that the state did not require the reporting of any psychological maladjustments for in-service teachers (Item 14). No one reported that their state had such a requirement. A similar number indicated the same non-requirements for reporting social/emotional maladjustments. When asked if the state required the reporting of maladjustments of certified individuals who are working on additional certificates (e.g. endorsements, add-on to the certificate) but are not presently teaching (Item 14), all but one indicate that the state had no

such requirement.

Most institutions reported that there were no legal requirements to be met once maladjustment had been identified. Forty-nine (49) NCATE institutions reported there were "none" (Item 15), while twenty-six (26) others didn't respond to the item. One can assume that 71% of the NCATE institutions in the study were not legally bound to a set procedure of handling maladjustments. A similar percentage was generated by the non-NCATE group. Where there are legal requirements, "informing the individual" and "maintaining confidentiality" were by far the greatest requirements. It is interesting to note that reporting the problem to the State Department of Education was required of only four (4) institutions (the response is possibly different from Item 14 because response to Item 15 could be in the context of undergraduate students). One institution indicated that they had to report such maladjustment to the individual's employer. Five (5) respondents had to provide a program of intervention, while one (1) was required to counsel out an individual (following "due process") from the program.

Respondents were asked to put in priority order what institutions do in the event that psychologicl and/or social/emotional problems are identified in students before admission to a teacher education program (Item 16). Ninety-five (95) NCATE respondents indicated that when such problems are identified, before admission, prospective teacher education students are referred to a faculty committee. The next most used approach was referring individuals to a mental health service. The third most used approach was the elimination of students from

the admissions process. Non-NCATE respondents (N=38) indicated, as their first priority, they request individual evaluations, followed by reference to a faculty committee, and then reference to a mental health service. Eliminating students from the admission process is a low priority for both groups, with non-NCATE respondents ranking it lower than their NCATE counterparts. An explanation for the non-NCATE use of individual evaluations (top priority procedure for non-NCATE, ranked fourth by NCATE respondents) might be a function of the nature of non-public institutions (which make up a large number of the non-NCATE respondents) who may operate on a more personal and individual basis than do NCATE (larger public) institutions. The reliance on faculty committees by NCATE institutions could be the result of a greater emphasis on "due process", this emphasis could be a result of the public nature of the NCATE group.

Respondents were than asked what they do with students who have manifested psycholocial and/or social/emotional problems after being admitted to a teacher education program (Item 16). The respondent groups tended to refer those individuals identified as having problems to faculty committees and/or to mental health services. Dropping students from programs is a least desirable procedure for both groups. It is interesting to note that once an individual is admitted to a program, non-NCATE institutions do not request an individual evaluation as readily as they did before admission to a program. Both groups had similar responses to the procedures they use, after admission, to deal with identified problems.

Both groups tend to employ a variety of procedures (such as retest, reevaluate, getting letters from psychology consultants, etc.) to determine if a student is fit to re-enter, or to continue in, a teacher education program (Item 17). Two of the non-NCATE institutions indicated that once an individual has been dismissed from a program, he/she is never readmitted. Only 32 (58%) of the non-NCATE institutions responded to Item 17, while 88 (83%) of the NCATE institutions responded. It is difficult to determine the reason for the differences in the response rate, other than to speculate that again, non-NCATE institutions are generally: 1) smaller, 2) private institutions and, 3) may feel that it is not necessary, or incumbent upon them, to give individuals another opportunity to enter teacher education programs. Consequently, NCATE institutions generally tend to be both larger and public may feel a greater obligation to the public, and most specifically to the individual student, to give that person an opportunity to question their evaluations and/or to be reassessed. In cases where individuals are dismissed from a teacher education program for psychological and social/emotional fitness, the respondents indicate (Item 18) that their decision would be supported by the superordinate administrators of the institutions (President, Vice-president, Dean, etc.). This is true for both NCATE and non-NCATE institutions.

Conclusions

Although the NCATE and non-NCATE institutions surveyed in this study responded similarly to many of the items, there were differences in responses between the two groups in several

notable areas. The differences found could be a function of NCATE institutions in this study being large public institutions with numerous students in their teacher education programs; the non-NCATE institutions tended to be small private institutions with much smaller teacher education enrollments.

It is evident that the majority of states do not have statutes or laws concerning fitness nor do they require evidence for either psychological or social/emotional fitness on the parts of teacher applicants for certification. Although the states do not require such evidence, institutions in this survey did consider the psychological and social/emotional fitness in their recommendations for teacher certification.

There was considerable agreement between the two respondent groups as related to the elements of psychological and social/emotional fitness. The elements listed were very similar across respondent groups and across fitness areas. "Overall stability" and "ability to function in the classroom" are the two elements that were mentioned most.

Very few institutions use formal instruments to assess psychological and/or social/emotional fitness. However, non-testing approaches are the desired technique used by both NCATE and non-NCATE institutions - with direct observation being the most used. These procedures are used for admitting students to teacher education programs or to student teaching. Information culled from these techniques are used by either deans or faculty committees.

States do not require the reporting of maladjustment problems

for in-service teachers or for individuals who are not teaching but are working on additional certifications. Where there are requirements, informing the individual and maintaining confidentiality are the most listed legal requirements.

Faculty committees and health services were the two options open to students who were identified as having psychological and social/emotional fitness problems before admission. Elimination from the admission process was also a low option excercised by respondents. Requests for individual psychological evaluations were used more by the non-NCATE institutions than NCATE institutions. After an individual has been admitted and psychological or social/emotional fitness problems were identified, faculty committees and health services were again two options that were used readily by the respondents. Individual evaluations were also used by the respondent groups.

Students in non-NCATE institutions may have a difficult time being readmitted into a program once they were dismissed because of psychological and/or social/emotional fitness problems. NCATE institutions appear to have a greater commitment to such readmission. This may be a function of the public nature of NCATE institutions in this study and their commitment to (or fear of) the "due process" procedures that they must follow. Institutions that readmit students, who had problems, employ re-evaluations of the student and use of psychiarist input in their process.

In a field that is labor intensive and has a considerable amount of interpersonal interaction between those concerned (teachers, students, administration, etc.), it is surprising that

states (as reported by the respondents) do not require documentation of psychological and social/emotional fitness for teaching. An explanation could be that very few states (or institutions) have been able to establish valid, reliable and "objective" instruments to assess levels of psychological and social/emotional fitness. This may also account for the reliances of non-testing and more subjective evaluations used by institutions to assess the psychological and social/emotional fitness of their students. This is clearly a significant problem and concern in the training and education of future teachers. Also, it is interesting to consider that most of the reform reports do not deal with this very crucial and significant area. It appears self-evident to the investigators that this a major area that should be dealt with as objectively and forthright as possible for the good of all concerned.

TABLE 1: TYPE AND TITLE OF TEACHER EDUCATION UNIT

	NCATE f*	NON-NCATE f*
Public	79	15
Non Public	24	40
School/College of Education	96	35
Within Non-School/ College of Education Unit	8	19

TABLE 2: TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT

	NCATE f*	NON-NCATE f*
to 999	4	6
1,000-4,999	33	33
5,000-9,999	17	7
10,000-14,999	15	2
15,000-24,999	23	3
25,000 +	14	4

TABLE 3: TOTAL TEACHER EDUCATION ENROLLMENT

	NCATE		NON-NCATE	
	Undergraduate f*	Graduate f*	Undergraduate f*	Graduate f*
49 and Below	6	2	11	8
50-99	2	11	13	8
100-249	13	25	14	2
250-499	24	20	9	8
500 +	55	31	8	6

*Not all institutions responded to each item. Total number of responding institutions: 106 NCATE; 55 Non-NCATE

Table 4: PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL FITNESS ITEMS

Instrument Item	Item Question	Frequency or Rank Order	
1.	State Statutes or Laws concerning:		
	A. Psychological Fitness	Yes	No
	NCATE	21	75
	NON-NCATE	12	43
	Total Represents 20 Different States		
	B. Social/Emotional Fitness		
	NCATE	26	72
	NON-NCATE	15	39
	Total Represents 20 Different States		
2.	State Department/State Certification Office Require Evidence of:		
	A. Psychological Fitness	Yes	No
	NCATE	15	56
	NON-NCATE	6	45
	B. Social/Emotional Fitness	Yes	No
	NCATE	17	67
	NON-NCATE	7	46
3.	Do you consider Pscyhological and/or Social/Emotional Fitness?:	Yes	No
	NCATE	77	30
	NON-NCATE	42	7
6.	If formal tests are used, when are they administered:	NCATE	NON-NCATE
	A. Admission to teacher education	9	2
	B. After being admitted to teacher education	1	1
	C. Admission to student teaching	1	1
	D. As part of exit procedure	1	1
	E. Other	0	0
	F. Do not use formal tests	0	32

Table 4 (Continued)

7. What other non-testing information is Used (rank order)?:	Rank Order NCATE	NON-NCATE
A. Interview	5	2.5
B. Direct observation	1	1
C. Anecdotal record	6	5
D. Indirect or informal observation	2	2.5
E. Microteaching and other course requisites	4	6
F. Critiques from cooperating teacher in student teaching	3	4
G. Other procedures	7	7
Number of Institutions Responding	103	48

8. If responded to # 7, when are they used?: (Multiple Responses Possible)		
A. For admission to teacher education	49	33
B. After being admitted to teacher education	49	35
C. Admission to student teaching	45	31
D. As part of exit procedure	30	21
E. Other	4	2
Number of Institutions Responding	89	43

9. What standardized instruments are used (for Psychological Fitness)?:		
A. MMPI	1	1
B. Sixteen Personality Factor Test	1	0
C. California Psychology Index	1	0
D. Thematic Apperception	0	0
E. Other:		
Self-Report Inventory	1	
Thurston Temperment Scale	1	
Adjective Self Description	1	
Own Instrument	1	
F. No standardized instruments are used	79	37

10. What non-standardized instruments are used (for Psychological Fitness)?:		
Recommendation Forms	1	1
Evaluation Forms	0	1
Observation Checklist	0	1
Modified Edwards	1	
Personality Inventory	1	
Autobio Information Form	1	
One word sentence completion	1	
No non-standardized instruments	77	31

Table 4 (Continued)

11. What Standardized Instruments are used for Social/Emotional Fitness)?:		
No standardized instruments are used	78	40
Number of Institutions Not Responding	28	15
12. What non-standardized instruments are used (For Social/Emotional Fitness)?:		
Observational checklist	0	1
Behavior in/out of class	0	1
Number of Institutions Not Responding	106	53

13. Who uses information on the psychological and/or social emotional fitness?:	NCATE	NON-NCATE
A. Faculty committee	8	6
B. Dean or designee	4	14
C. Chair/director of department that houses teacher education program	2	7
D. Other:		
Teacher Education Committee	1	2
Counselors	1	1
Student teacher coordinator	1	0
Number of Institutions Not Responding	89	25

14. Does the State Require Reporting any Maladjustments for In-service Teachers?:	Yes	No
A. Psychological Problems		
NCATE	0	100
NON-NCATE	0	50
B. Social/Emotional Problems		
NCATE	0	98
NON-NCATE	0	50

Does the state require reporting any maladjustments for those who are not in-service teachers, but are working on additional certificates?:	Yes	No
A. Psychological Problems		
NCATE	1	97
NON-NCATE	0	49
B. Social/Emotional Problems		
NCATE	1	97
NON-NCATE	0	49

Table 4 (Continued)

15. What are the Legal Requirements You Must Meet Once Maladjustments are Identified?:

	NCATE	NON-NCATE
	(Multiple Responses Possible)	
A. Must inform the individual	17	11
B. Report Problem to State Department of Education	4	0
C. Report to individual's employer	1	0
D. Provide a program of intervention	4	1
E. Maintains confidentiality	18	11
F. Other:		
Report major crime	0	1
Refer to counselor	0	1
Maladjustment must be corrected (by the individual) before certification	0	1
Counsel out of program process, due process is followed	1	0
G. None	49	16
Number of Institutions Responding	31	14
Number of Institutions Not Responding	26	25

16. If problems are identified what do you do to the individual (in priority order - 1st 2nd, 3rd, 4th)?:

	Priority Order Before Admission	Priority Order After Admission
NCATE		
A. Refer to Faculty Committee	1	1
B. Refer to Mental Health Services	2	2
C. Request Individual Evaluation	4	3
D. Eliminate Student from Admission Process	3	N/A
E. Drop Student from Program	N/A	4
F. Other:	5	5
Number of Institutions Responding	95	95
NON-NCATE		
A. Refer to Faculty	2	2
B. Refer to Mental Health Services	3	1
C. Request Individual Evaluation	1	3
D. Eliminate Student from Admission Process	4	N/A
E. Drop Student from Program	N/A	4
F. Other	5	5
Number of Institutions Responding	38	38

Table 4 (Continued)

17. What Do You Employ to Determine Readmission to a Program if an Individual Was Found to Be Unfit?:

	NCATE	NON-NCATE
	(Multiple Responses Possible)	
A. Retest	6	2
B. Re-Evaluate	55	16
C. Letter of Support from Psychiatrist/ Psychology Consultant	41	17
D. Other		
Not Readmitted	0	2
Interview	1	2
Number of Institutions Responding	88	32

18. How Supportive of Your Decision Would the Following Be if You Dismissed an Individual Who is Deemed Unfit?:

NCATE	Don't Know	Not Suppt.	Suppt.	Highly Suppt.
A. President/Chancellor	18	2	30	39
B. Vice-President/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	10	2	36	39
C. Vice-President/Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs	11	4	36	34
D. Immediate Line Superior (e.g. Dean, Department Chair)	3	2	18	51
NON-NCATE				
A. President/Chancellor	6	0	12	23
B. Vice-President/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	6	1	8	26
C. Vice President/Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs	6	0	10	23
D. Immediate Line Superior (e.g. Dean, Department Chair)	0	0	4	26

REFERENCES

Babbie, E.R. (1973). Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the twenty-first century. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Flygare, T.J. (1979). Schools and the law. Phi Delta Kappan. 2, 456-457.

Gorth, W.P. and Chernoff, M.L. (Eds.). (1986). Testing for teacher certification. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaun Associates Publishers.

Holmes Group. (1986) Tomorrow's teachers, a report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Marion, P.B. and Iovacchini, E.V. (1983). Services for handicapped students in higher education: An analysis of national trends. Journal of College Student Personnel. 3, 131-138.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform. Washington, D.C.: Author

Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Public Law 93-112, Section 504.